arXiv:1602.02906v2 [math.NT] 2 Mar 2016

PRIMES AND PRIME IDEALS IN SHORT INTERVALS

L.GRENIÉ, G.MOLTENI and A.PERELLI

Abstract. We prove the analog of Cramér's short intervals theorem for primes in arithmetic progressions and prime ideals, under the relevant Riemann Hypothesis. Both results are uniform in the data of the underlying structure. Our approach is based mainly on the inertia property of the counting functions of primes and prime ideals.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 11N13, 11R44

Keywords: primes in arithmetic progressions, prime ideals, short intervals, Riemann Hypothesis.

1. Introduction

A famous theorem of H.Cramér [2] states that, assuming the Riemann Hypothesis, there is always a prime between x and $x+h$ provided $x \ge x_0$ and $c_1\sqrt{x}\log x \le h \le x$, with suitable constants $x_0, c_1 > 0$. Actually, under the same assumptions we have that

$$\pi(x+h) - \pi(x) \ge c_2 \frac{h}{\log x}$$

with a suitable $c_2 > 0$, and also that

$$\pi(x+h) - \pi(x) \sim \frac{h}{\log x}$$

provided $x \ge h = \infty(\sqrt{x}\log x)$. Here $f(x) = \infty(g(x))$ means that $f(x)/g(x) \to \infty$ as $x \to \infty$. Apart from the explicit value of the involved constants, this is still the best known result about primes in short intervals, under the Riemann Hypothesis. Sharper results can be obtained assuming various forms of the pair-correlation conjecture for the zeta zeros, see *e.g.* Heath-Brown [7], Languasco-Perelli-Zaccagnini [13] and the literature quoted there. A simple proof of Cramér's theorem can be obtained from a suitable smoothed explicit formula for $\psi(x)$, see the footnote on p.256 of Ingham [9].

In this paper we show that rather general theorems of Cramér's type follow, under the appropriate Riemann Hypothesis, from two results often ready in the literature, namely a short intervals mean-square estimate and a Brun-Titchmarsh type theorem. Indeed, the latter result implies that the relevant counting function satisfies a suitable inertia property, which is then played against the short intervals mean-square bound to get a contradiction if the interval is not too short. We illustrate our approach in the case of primes in arithmetic progressions and of prime ideals, since apparently these results do not appear in the literature. In the first case all the ingredients are already known, so we proceed directly to the proof of Cramér's theorem for arithmetic progressions. In the case of algebraic number fields we first deal with the required ingredients; see in particular Proposition 1 below, which is of some independent interest. In both cases our results are uniform in the data of the underlying structure. However, in the second case the inertia method gives Proposition 3, which in the uniformity aspect is weaker than Theorem 2, proved here by the classical smoothed explicit formula approach. This is due to the lack, in the current literature, of sharp uniform bounds of Brun-Titchmarsh type for number fields. We shall discuss this issue later on in the paper.

As usual, for $(a,q)=1$ we write

$$\pi(x;q,a)=\sum_{\substack{p\le x\\ p\equiv a \pmod q}} 1$$

and let $\varphi(q)$ denote Euler's function. Moreover, given an algebraic number field K of degree n_K, we denote by d_K the absolute value of its discriminant, by $\mathfrak{P}$ the prime ideals of the ring $\mathcal{O}_K$ of the integers of K, by $N(\mathfrak{P})$ their norm and write

$$\pi_K(x)=\sum_{N(\mathfrak{P})\le x} 1.$$

Finally, given an integer $q\ge 1$ and a number field K, we denote by GRH and DRH the Riemann Hypothesis for the Dirichlet L-functions associated with the characters $\chi \pmod q$ and for the Dedekind zeta function $\zeta_K(s)$, respectively. With this notation, our main results are as follows.

Theorem 1. *Let $(a,q)=1$ and assume GRH. Then there exist absolute constants $x_0,c_1,c_2>0$ such that for $x\ge x_0$ and $c_1\varphi(q)\sqrt{x}\log x\le h\le x$ we have*

$$\pi(x+h;q,a)-\pi(x;q,a)\ge c_2\frac{h}{\varphi(q)\log x}.$$

Clearly, under the same assumptions the same argument also gives

$$\pi(x+h;q,a)-\pi(x;q,a)\sim \frac{h}{\varphi(q)\log x}$$

provided $x\ge h=\infty(\varphi(q)\sqrt{x}\log x)$.

Theorem 2. *Assume DRH for the number field K. Then there exist absolute constants $x_0,c_1,c_2>0$ such that for $x\ge x_0$ and $c_1(n_K\log x+\log d_K)\sqrt{x}\le h\le x$ we have*

$$\pi_K(x+h)-\pi_K(x)\ge c_2\frac{h}{\log x}.$$

As before, the same proof shows also that

$$\pi_K(x+h)-\pi_K(x)\sim \frac{h}{\log x} \tag{1}$$

provided $x\ge h=\infty\big((n_K\log x+\log d_K)\sqrt{x}\big)$. Note that Theorem 2 represents an instance of Lang's [12] "recipe" asserting that, broadly speaking, when extending to a number field K the classical results known for $\mathbb{Q}$ one should replace $\log x$ by $n_K\log x+\log d_K$. Note also that if K is a cyclotomic field then the quality of the K-uniformity in Theorem 2 is comparable to the q-uniformity in Theorem 1.

We conclude remarking that the technique in the proof of the above theorems works for rather general counting functions, giving individual short intervals results as soon as suitably sharp short intervals mean-values and inertia type result are available.

2. Proofs

As customary, we prove Theorem 1 for the ψ-function and then the required result is recovered by elementary arguments since $h/\varphi(q)$ is large enough. Let X be sufficiently large, $q,h\le X$, $(a,q)=1$ and write

$$\Delta(x,h)=\psi(x+h;q,a)-\psi(x;q,a)-\frac{h}{\varphi(q)}.$$

The required mean-square bound follows from a result of Prachar [15] under GRH (see also

Goldston-Yıldırım [5]), namely

$$\int_X^{2X} |\Delta(x,h)|^2 dx \ll hX\log^2(qX), \tag{2}$$

where the constant in the $\ll$-symbol is absolute. Let now $h/\varphi(q) > X^{1/10}$. From the well known Brun-Titchmarsh theorem, see Montgomery-Vaughan [14], we deduce that if there exists $\overline{x} \in (X, 2X)$ such that

$$|\Delta(\overline{x},h)| > \frac{1}{4}\frac{h}{\varphi(q)}, \tag{3}$$

then

$$|\Delta(x,h)| > c\frac{h}{\varphi(q)} \tag{4}$$

for all $x \in (\overline{x} - c'h, \overline{x} + c'h)$, with certain absolute constants $c, c' > 0$. Inequalities (3) and (4) express the inertia property of the ψ-function (see also Theorem 1 of Bazzanella-Perelli [1]).

Let now

$$E(X,h) = \{x \in [X, 2X] : |\Delta(x,h)| > \frac{1}{4}\frac{h}{\varphi(q)}\}$$

and suppose that $E(X,h) \neq \emptyset$. Then from (2)-(4) we get

$$h(\frac{h}{\varphi(q)})^2 \ll \int_X^{2X} |\Delta(x,h)|^2 dx \ll hX\log^2(qX),$$

thus $h \ll \sqrt{X}\varphi(q)\log(qX)$. Hence, with suitable absolute constants in the $\gg$-symbols and provided x is sufficiently large,

$$\psi(x+h;q,a) - \psi(x;q,a) \gg \frac{h}{\varphi(q)}$$

if $x \geq h \gg \varphi(q)\sqrt{x}\log(qx)$. Theorem 1, and the statement after it, therefore follow. □

As anticipated in the Introduction, in the number fields case we first present the proof of a weaker form of Theorem 2 in the uniformity aspect, obtained by the inertia approach. Write

$$\psi_K(x) = \sum_{N(\mathfrak{P}^m)\leq x} \log N(\mathfrak{P}) = \sum_{n\leq x} \Lambda_K(n) \ \text{ say, and } \ \Delta_K(x,h) = \psi_K(x+h) - \psi_K(x) - h,$$

and let $L = \log X$. The analog of (2) is given by

Proposition 1. *Assume DRH for the number field K. Then there exist absolute constants $c, X_0 > 0$ such that for $X \geq X_0$ and $2 \leq h \leq X$ we have*

$$\int_X^{2X} |\Delta_K(x,h)|^2 \mathrm{d}x \leq cX(h+L^2)(n_K L + \log d_K)^2.$$

Proof. Let $2 \leq T \leq x$; the constants in the O- and $\ll$-symbols below are absolute. Denoting by $N_K(T)$ the number of zeros $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$ of $\zeta_K(s)$ with $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ and $|\gamma| \leq T$, using the notation in the Introduction we unconditionally have

$$N_K(T) = \frac{n_K}{\pi}T\log T + \frac{T}{\pi}\log\left(\frac{d_K}{(2\pi e)^{n_K}}\right) + O\big(\log(d_K T^{n_K})\big); \tag{5}$$

see Kadiri-Ng [10]. Moreover, using (5) in the explicit formula in Lagarias-Odlyzko [11] (specialized to the case of $\zeta_K(s)$) we have, again unconditionally, that

$$\psi_K(x) = x - \sum_{|\gamma|\leq T} \frac{x^\rho}{\rho} + R_K(x,T) \tag{6}$$

with

$$R_K(x,T) = O\Big(\frac{x}{T}(n_K\log x + \log d_K)\log x\Big).$$

Proposition 1 follows now from (4) and (6) by the classical arguments in Lemmas 5 and 6 of Saffari-Vaughan [16] (notice a misprint in (6.20) there, where h^2 on the r.h.s. should be replaced by h); here is a brief sketch. Arguing as in Lemma 6 of [16] we have (see (6.21) there)

$$\int_X^{2X} |\Delta_K(x,h)|^2 \mathrm{d}x \ll \frac{X}{h}\int_{h/3X}^{3h/X}\left(\int_X^{3X} |\psi_K(x+\theta x) - \psi_K(x) - \theta x|^2 \mathrm{d}x\right)\mathrm{d}\theta. \tag{7}$$

Choosing $T = X$ in (6), the contribution of $R_K(x,T)$ to the r.h.s. of (7) is

$$\ll XL^2(n_KL + \log d_K)^2, \tag{8}$$

while the contribution of the remaining part of the explicit formula is, thanks to (5),

$$\ll X^2\big(\frac{h}{X}\big)^2 N_K\left(\frac{X}{h}\right)\max_{2\le t\le X/h}\big(N_K(t+1) - N_K(t)\big) \ll hX(n_KL + \log d_K)^2. \tag{9}$$

Proposition 1 follows from (7)-(9). □

Proposition 1 represents another instance of Lang's "recipe" reported in the Introduction. As far as we know, such a phenomenon has not been established in the case of Brun-Titchmarsh type bounds, and actually it is not clear to us how should the right extension look like in this case; we briefly discuss this issue at the end of the section. Hence we use the following simple but uniform bound, which however is unlikely to be sharp in the range needed here.

Proposition 2. *Let K be a number field and $2 \le h \le x$. Then*

$$\pi_K(x+h) - \pi_K(x) \le 4n_K\frac{h}{\log h}. \tag{10}$$

Proof. Again we use the notation in the Introduction. Let $\{k_j\}_{j\in J}$, $k_j \ge 1$, be the exponents of the prime powers in the interval $(x, x+h]$; clearly, $|J| \le h+1$. Since it is well known that for $1 \le k \le n_K$ there are at most n_K/k prime ideals of $\mathcal{O}_K$ with norm p^k, we have

$$\pi_K(x+h) - \pi_K(x) \le n_K\sum_{j\in J}\frac{1}{k_j}\big(\pi((x+h)^{1/k_j}) - \pi(x^{1/k_j})\big).$$

But $(x+h)^{1/k} - x^{1/k} \le x^{1/k}h/(kx)$, hence, applying to $\pi((x+h)^{1/k_j}) - \pi(x^{1/k_j})$ the Brun-Titchmarsh theorem when $k_j = 1$ (Montgomery-Vaughan [14] with modulus $q = 1$) and the trivial bound $\le h/(k_j\sqrt{x}) + 1$ when $k_j \ge 2$, we get

$$\pi_K(x+h) - \pi_K(x) \le 2n_K\frac{h}{\log h} + n_K\sum_{j\in J, k_j\ge 2}\frac{1}{k_j}\big(\frac{h}{\sqrt{x}}\frac{1}{k_j} + 1\big).$$

Since clearly $\sum_{j\in J,k_j\ge 2} 1/k_j \le \log(|J|+1) \le \log(h+2)$, Proposition 2 follows by a simple computation. □

Proposition 3. *Theorem 2 holds with $c_1 n_K^{1/2}(n_K\log x + \log d_K)\sqrt{x} \le h \le x$ in place of $c_1(n_K\log x + \log d_K)\sqrt{x} \le h \le x$.*

Proof. We argue along the lines of Theorem 1. Indeed, for X sufficiently large and e.g. $h/n_K > X^{1/10}$, from Proposition 2 we have that if there exists $\overline{x} \in (X, 2X)$ with

$$|\Delta_K(\overline{x}, h)| > \frac{1}{4}h, \quad \text{then} \quad |\Delta_K(x,h)| > ch$$

for all $x \in (\overline{x} - c'h/n_K, \overline{x} + c'h/n_K)$, with certain absolute constants $c, c' > 0$. Playing this against Proposition 1 we therefore obtain that

$$\frac{h^3}{n_K} \ll (n_K L + \log d_K)^2 h X.$$

Hence $h \ll n_K^{1/2}(n_K L + \log d_K)\sqrt{X}$, and Proposition 3 follows. □

The sharper result stated in Theorem 2 is obtained using the direct approach by the smoothed explicit formula. We follow the general lines of the proofs in Dudek [3] and Dudek-Grenié-Molteni [4], where explicit versions of Ingham's approach to Cramér's theorem are developed. Integrating the infinite explicit formula for $\psi_K(x)$ from 2 to x, see (1.3a) and Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 in Grenié-Molteni [6], we obtain

$$\int_2^x \psi_K(t)\mathrm{d}t = \frac{x^2}{2} - \sum_\rho \frac{x^{\rho+1}}{\rho(\rho+1)} - c_K x + c'_K + O(n_K x \log x),$$

where ρ runs over the non-trivial zeros of $\zeta_K(s)$ and c_K, c'_K are certain constants depending on K; we are not concerned with their value since c_K and c'_K simply disappear after the manipulations leading to the next displayed equation. Introducing the weights $w(n) = \max(1 - \frac{|x-n|}{h}, 0)$ as in the last row of p.773 of [3] and arguing as on p.774 there we get

$$\sum_{x-h<n<x+h} \Lambda_K(n) w(n) = h - \frac{1}{h}\sum_\rho \frac{(x+h)^{\rho+1} - 2x^{\rho+1} + (x-h)^{\rho+1}}{\rho(\rho+1)} + O\Big(n_K \frac{x}{h}\log x\Big).$$

Now we split the sum over the ζ_K-zeros into the subsums Σ_1 and Σ_2 cutting at $T = x/h$, and use DRH and (5) as in the proof of Theorem 1.2 of [3], thus obtaining

$$W(x,h) := \sum_{x-h<n<x+h} \Lambda_K(n) w(n) = h + O((n_K \log x + \log d_K)\sqrt{x}) + O\Big(n_K \frac{x}{h}\log x\Big). \tag{11}$$

From (11) we obtain the behavior of the unweighted sum, observing that for every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\big((1-\varepsilon)W(x,(1-\varepsilon)h) - W(x,h)\big) &\le \psi_K(x+h) - \psi_K(x-h) \\ &\le \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\big((1+\varepsilon)W(x,(1+\varepsilon)h) - W(x,h)\big) \end{aligned}$$

since $\Lambda_K(n) \ge 0$. Theorem 2 and the assertion after it follow at once. □

We conclude with a brief discussion on the Brun-Titchmarsh theorem for number fields and its relevance to this paper. Note that the dependence on the data of K in Proposition 2, where bounded h are allowed, is essentially best possible. Indeed, if a prime $p \in (x, x+2]$, say, splits in O_K into the product of n_K prime ideals of norm p, then clearly $\pi_K(x+2) - \pi_K(x) \ge n_K$, while Proposition 2 gives $\pi_K(x+2) - \pi_K(x) \le c n_K$ with some absolute $c > 0$. Note that, although the constant in the classical Brun-Titchmarsh theorem is of great interest, the absolute constant in front of n_K in (10) plays essentially no role in this paper. For larger h the dependence on K in (10) is unsatisfactory, as indeed the prime ideal theorem, or (1), shows.

The bounds of Brun-Titchmarsh type are usually obtained by the Selberg sieve. Apparently, an application of the Selberg sieve to $\pi_K(x+h) - \pi_K(x)$, see e.g. Hinz-Loedemann [8], brings into play the residue ν_K of the Dedekind zeta function $\zeta_K(s)$. It is well known that ν_K depends on several invariants of K, and even under DRH its dependence on such invariants is not completely under control. This adds some difficulties to the problem of obtaining sharp versions of Proposition 2. Perhaps one can prove that

$$\pi_K(x+h) - \pi_K(x) \le ch/\log(h/d_K),$$

but this is weaker than what is obtainable for an abelian extension $K/\mathbb{Q}$, namely

$$\pi_K(x+h) - \pi_K(x) \leq ch/\log(h/q_K), \tag{12}$$

where q_K is the conductor of K. Bound (12) can be obtained coupling the classical Brun-Titchmarsh theorem for arithmetic progressions with the Kronecker-Weber theorem for abelian extensions of $\mathbb{Q}$. Actually, when (12) is coupled with Proposition 1 we get back, in the abelian case, a result of the same quality as Theorem 1.

Acknowledgements. We wish to thank Olivier Ramaré for detecting some inaccuracies in a previous version. The authors are members of the INdAM groups GNSAGA and GNAMPA.

References

[1] D.Bazzanella, A.Perelli - *The exceptional set for the number of primes in short intervals* - J. Number Theory **80** (2000), 109–124.

[2] H.Cramér - *Some theorems concerning prime numbers* - Ark. Mat. Astr. Fys. **15** (1920), 1–33.

[3] A.W.Dudek - *On the Riemann hypothesis and the difference between primes* - Int. J. Number Theory **11** (2015), 771–778.

[4] A.W.Dudek, L.Grenié, G.Molteni - *Primes in explicit short intervals on RH* - To appear in Int. J. Number Theory 2015.

[5] D.A.Goldston, Y.Yıldırım - *Primes in short segments of arithmetic progressions* - Can. J. Math. **50** (1998), 563–580.

[6] L.Grenié, G.Molteni - *Explicit smoothed prime ideals theorems under GRH* - To appear in Math. Comp. 2015.

[7] D.R.Heath-Brown - *Gaps between primes, and the pair correlation of zeros of the zeta-function* - Acta Arith. **41** (1982), 85–99.

[8] J.Hinz, M.Loedemann - *On Siegel zeros of Hecke-Landau zeta-functions* - Mh. Math. **118** (1994), 231–248.

[9] A.E.Ingham - *On the difference between consecutive primes* - Quart. J. Math. **8** (1937), 255–266.

[10] H.Kadiri, N.Ng - *Explicit zero density theorems for Dedekind zeta functions* - J. Number Theory **132** (2012), 748-775.

[11] J.C.Lagarias, A.M.Odlyzko - *Effective versions of the Chebotarev density theorem* - In *Algebraic Number Fields*, ed. by A.Fröhlich, p.409–464, Academic Press 1977.

[12] S.Lang - *On the zeta function of number fields* - Invent. Math. **12** (1971), 337–345.

[13] A.Languasco, A.Perelli, A.Zaccagnini - *An extension of the pair-correlation conjecture and applications* - To appear in Math. Res. Letters.

[14] H.L.Montgomery, R.C.Vaughan - The large sieve - Mathematika **20** (1973), 119–134.

[15] K.Prachar - *Generalisation of a theorem of A. Selberg on primes in short intervals* - In *Topics in Number Theory*, Coll. Math. Soc. Bolyai **13**, ed. by P.Turán, p.267–280, North-Holland 1976.

[16] B.Saffari, R.C.Vaughan - *On the fractional parts of x/n and related sequences. II* - Ann. Inst. Fourier **27** (1977), 1–30.

Loïc Grenié, Dipartimento di Ingegneria Gestionale, dell'Informazione e della Produzione, Università di Bergamo, viale Marconi 5, 24044 Dalmine (BG), Italy. e-mail: loic.grenie@gmail.com

Giuseppe Molteni, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Milano, via Saldini 50, 20133 Milano, Italy. e-mail: giuseppe.molteni1@unimi.it

Alberto Perelli, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Genova, via Dodecaneso 35, 16146 Genova, Italy. e-mail: perelli@dima.unige.it